Names of Persons as a Central Component of Language Life of Society

Ibraximova D. T.

Kashkadarya VXTXQTMOHM Department of Methods of Teaching Languages great teacher

Abstract: Anthroponymic systems of languages reflect the history and culture, worldview and values of the people. Therefore, the study of this layer of linguistic vocabulary should play an important role in ethno linguistics, one of the directions of which is to reveal the image of the people in the language. On the other hand, the study of personal names is also of practical importance: knowledge of the development trends of the personal name system helps to influence these processes consciously and scientifically based in the context of language policy.

Keywords: anthroponymic unit, anthropocentrism, linguoculture, onomastics, asemantic naming, anaphoric connection, onomastic space.

In addition to its nominative features, it is also necessary to study its communicative possibilities in order to know the nature of each lexical unit, including individual names. When a person's names are studied as "material or means of activity", many hidden aspects are revealed, as well as the communicative-pragmatic features of the text, which arise from the interaction with other language units. [Superanskaya 2004]

Defining the essence of man as a human being, according to W. Humboldt, means the separation of human characteristics inherent in man. Language is one of such means, a person becomes a person only through language and consciousness, and in the process a person's creative power, his inner potential is activated [Humboldt 1984: 55,314,349]. For this reason, the study of the spiritual-logical, semantic-functional and linguocultural features of units within the conceptual sphere of "man" in comparison with different languages is becoming one of the promising areas of modern linguistics.

The quality of things and events in an objective being, the actions of which are felt by the possessors of language, are called by comparison with themselves, arising from a peculiar style of perception. It is illogical for a human being to be the basis of this process, to name things and to interpret their essence separately from man. Hence, in the anthropocentric paradigm, language is a key element in shaping the human personality. SG Vorkachev argues that today's development of linguistics, or anthropocentric paradigm, has given man a "dimension of all things" and directed his worldview to a certain center [Vorkachov 2007: 21,25].

The XXI century began as a period of revival of linguistics, and each passing period has witnessed changes and developments in the human mind. For example, the 19th century was a century of comparative-historical linguistics, while the 20th century was a period of structuralism in linguistics, and the 21st century was dominated by the anthropocentric paradigm. It should be noted that the anthropocentric approach to language in the study of linguoculturalism was developed by the German linguist V. it is noted that the background goes back to Humboldt's ideas. In the focus of linguists began to be interpreted as a priority of language speakers - human beings, representing a particular culture [Maslova 2007: 72; Kubryakova 2004: 9; Popova, Sternin 2007: 10, Evans 2007: VII].

The cognitive-semiotic approach to the study of personal names implies the participation of cultural language in the research coordinate system. From the point of view of the cognitive-semiotic approach, the artistic onomasticon exists in two dimensions: on the one hand, it reflects the clear traditions and rules of naming; on the other hand it is part of the textile world, which

reflects the characteristics of the author's creative ideas. According to A.A. Ufimtseva, "... linguistic naming activity is related to the typical image of the individual and the general experience of the language community, that is, the nominative function of words has a social and psychological basis" [131: 43].

Researchers have repeatedly pointed out that the formation of a linguistic sign is a multi-step process. In the first stage of this process, the actions of seeing and perceiving objects in the universe are performed, then imagination and understanding of these objects are formed (ie, the actions of the conceptual stage are performed), and finally, in the last stage, the actions related to the linguistic realization of the concept are needed. The most important of these actions are conceptualization actions, which lead to a clear understanding of reality and the choice of linguistic sign [108: 19-34; 76: 60-73].

Conceptualization activities, in turn, are multi-stage, the implementation of which requires the performance of various actions. According to R.I. Pavilionis, the emergence of a concept is the result of the activity of perceiving the universe, because in the same process in the human mind is born a certain understanding of the perceived object. The philosopher, who wants to clarify his point, writes, "The process of knowing is the process of forming a content or concept that is a collection of information about perceived objects" [92: 101-102]. It is in this process that the first images of personal names are formed into prototypes. According to VN Telia, the emergence of a prototype structure implies a more complete perception of reality [119: 94] (compare: Aliferinko 2005).

Different verbal variants of names are a way of distinguishing names in the same family: "Otabek - Otash, Otti, Bek, Ota, Oto; Gulnora - Guli, Gulya, Gulli, Gulish, Gul; Ivan - Ivanushka, Vanya, Vanechka, Ivashek, Iva; Dmitriy - Mitya, Dima, Mitenka, Dimochka; Catherine - Kate, Kitty, Katya; Daniel - Dan, Dany, Danny "and others. .

It appears in the pseudo-suffix elements of the same suffix or onim. In rare cases, when separate asymmetric naming segments coincide, it may be noted that the onyms in the family are only phonetically related: "Children of Zilola, Hilola, Shalola, and Lola Gullola"; "Children of Ubaydullo and Zubaydullo Vaidullo"; "Ivan, Bogdan, Drugan Dmitrievs" and others. Finally, the degree of accuracy is less pronounced, but the most common anaphoric connection is manifested in the similarity of the beginnings of the names of these close relatives: "Zafar - Zarif, Dilshod - Dilxush - Dilnur - Dilbar"; "Maryam - Marziya - Marhabo - Marhamat". The same situation can be observed in names and surnames: "Fazliddin Fayozov, Turob Tola, Hulkar Hamidova" and others.

Thus, in isolated families, perhaps, according to established tradition, there is an attempt to unite members of a family or family tree by giving children common names or names that repeat sounds. Such phenomena are probably normal, probably not uncommon, they may occur from time to time, but they are very noticeable in the general anthroponymic background. And this proves that the idea that personal names have no meaning is unfounded. There is no doubt that in the name of any person, as in other words in the language, there are all kinds of semantics. In addition, we would like to dwell on the conceptual meaning of personal names, which are formed in the process of application in various communicative practices, because it is in this process that an attitude of special value to personal names is formed.

1. Concepts based on person names differ in type and conceptual "burden". For example, for Russians, the concept of Ivan is stronger than the concept of Sergei.

2. Here is one of the ways to identify and describe the conceptual content associated with the use of statistics from Internet search engines. A query for a word on the Internet usually comes with the word indicating the number of pages that appear in the body of the search engine. Behind this type of quantitative index is important information about the semantics, pragmatics, syntagmatics of a particular word, but first and foremost it reflects the conceptual content.

3. All types of names, usually not defined in philological dictionaries, and even fake names can be easily found on the Internet. The following is a list of common Uzbek names in descending order (2021 Google search engine data):

Alisher - 11 600 000, Anvar - 4 200 000, Shavkat - 3 670 000, Islam - 3 320 000, Nurbek - 2 150 000, Muhammad - 2 060 000, Temur - 1 540 000, Mustafa - 290 000 context.

The fact that the presence of personal names in any language is mandatory is known as a linguistic universality. VN Toporov: "There is no human society without a name. This is the reason why it is considered to be a feature of human communities that distinguishes human beings from animals"[Toporov: 1962].

AK Matveev wrote that "the thing that finds the brightest expression of a person's" identity ", the formation of the human personality, the development of personal self-awareness - is his name" [Matveev].

Along with acknowledging that human names are universal, we take another step - and assume that any person's name is anthropocentric, meaning that it not only individualizes the object but also humanizes it, because the person's name belongs primarily to the person himself. It is no coincidence that anthroponymy is the core of any language onomastic system. Moreover, the essence of all other species peculiar to names is that they resemble anthroponyms. There are no nameless people, and there can be no nameless people, but there are unnamed mountains, rivers, lakes, and even settlements (these are not just places where people leave, that is, "uninhabited" settlements). Geographical objects get their names only through man.

A person's name is more of a social sign than any other sign of language, but it is not enough that it is social; it depends on a particular person's personality and specific human characteristics. The name of a person can also appear outside of society, for example, in the speech activity of a hermit who lives not among people but among inanimate objects and dumb animals - he gives a name first to those around him.

By calling something by its proper name, man enters into a conversation with that thing as an equal subject to himself, because he already has his own name as a human being. Many onomastics take on a unique name outside of anthropology, as if at the expense of any geographical object (and created only by human hands) "expanding" onomastic space to even cosmic objects, claiming that these objects are spontaneous objects and that these objects are human consciousness, human knowledge easily convinced that they are not objects. The separation of the ridge from the plain is the result of human mental activity, when in fact there is no boundary between them: the ridge is a continuation of the plain.

Ethnonyms are just as similar to anthroponyms as a group of people understood to be "peoples" is similar to individuals. If a nation does not have its own name, which is understood as a unique name, then it is not a nation, but a bunch of other people (if we understand a community from tribe to nation as "people", that is, any association of people of the same origin - blood relatives? , whether cultural or state-specific). If a tribe or people does not think of itself as a separate tribe or people worthy of its name, then for it there are no tribes and peoples at all, and at the same time, there are no ethnonyms. At this stage of social development, it makes no sense to use terms such as tribes, peoples, not to mention ethnonyms. According to ON Trubachev, the birth of such contradictions as "we are them", "ours are strangers" is the first and decisive step towards the emergence of ethnonyms. Saying "we are them" and "ours are strangers" are already the first ethnonyms.

The practical significance of learning personal names is that two trends in name selection collide - the preservation of traditions and the pursuit of innovation. The criteria for choosing a name reflect the worldview of the society, especially its rapid development, intercultural relations, social shifts, and so on. is a very strong indicator for cycles. The comparison of common names used to create the onomological concept and the results of the typological study allow us to draw conclusions about some typologically similar phenomena in languages belonging to different

linguistic families.

The cognitive aspect of the study of anthroponyms mentioned in written monuments is associated with the change of the scientific paradigm of modern linguistics, the development of an anthropocentric approach to linguistic phenomena, which made a special contribution to revealing the specific information nature of various anthroponymic units and their cognitive potential. The possibility of a cognitive approach suggests that the onomastic system itself, as a unit filled with information about linguistic processes that can be seen in the analysis of various aspects of the anthroponym, is legitimate to be understood as the center of the human universe.

References:

1. Croft W. Syntactic categories and grammatical relation: The cognitive organization. – Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003. –133p.

2. Даниева М.Дж. Когнитивные особенности субстантивных словосочетаний в английском языке. Monograph. LAP LAMBERT Academic Publishing; SIA OmniScriptum Publishing. Riga: Latvia. 2018. 65 p.

3. Ellis, A. and M. Beechley. "Emotional Disturbance in Children with Peculiar Given Names." *Journal of Genetic Psychology* 85 (1954): 337-339.

4. Feldman, Harold. "The Problem of Personal Names as a Universal Element in Culture." *American Imago*16 (1959): 237-250.

5. Гальперин И.Р. Текст как объект лингвистического исследования. – Москва, 2006. – 144 с.

6. Hartman, A. Arthur, Robert C. Nicolay, and Jesse Hurley. "Unique Personal Names as a Social Adjustment Factor." *Journal of Social Psychology* 75 (1968): 107-110.

   Jespersen O. Philosophy of Grammar. – Moscow: PH of Foreign Literature, 1958. – 404 p.

7. Кубрякова Е.С. Язык и знание. На пути получения знаний о языке: Части речи с когнитивной точки зрения. Роль языка в познании мира. – Москва, 2004. – 560 с.

8. Lakoff G., Brugman C. Argument Forms in Lexical Semantics// Proceedings of 12th Annual Meeting of Berkeley Linguistic Society. Berkeley, 1986. –P.32-45.

9. Лосев А.Ф. Языковая структура. – Москва, МОПИ. 1983. – 374с.

   Murphy, William F. "A Note on the Significance of Names." *Psychoanalytical Quarterly* 26 (1957): 91-106.

10. Savage, B. M. and F. L. Wells. "Note on Singularity in Given Names." *Journal of Social Psychology* 27 (1948): 271-272.

11. Smith, Elsdon C. *Treasury of Name Lore.* New York: Harper and Row, 1967.

12. Топорова Т. В. Культура в зеркале языка: древнегерманские двучленные имена собственные. М.: Языки русской культуры, 1996